

#### IV. REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending in this action. By this Amendment, the title has been revised. Applicants do not acquiesce in the correctness of the objections and rejections and reserve the right to present specific arguments regarding any rejected claims not specifically addressed. Reconsideration in view of the above amendment and following remarks is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, the specification is objected to because the title is allegedly not descriptive. By this Amendment, the title has been revised to be further descriptive. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the objection.

In the Office Action, claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as allegedly being anticipated by Barrett et al. (US Pub. No. 2005/0055661), hereinafter “Barrett.” Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for the reasons that follow.

With respect to independent claims 1, 8 and 15, Barrett does not disclose each and every claimed feature. First of all, Barrett only discloses “[using] the same design manipulation processes for both chip design and kerf design” (abstract), but does not disclose generating a process aid on a wafer, as claimed in the claimed invention. In the claimed invention, a process aid is “any device provided on a wafer that assists in some process step, but does not ultimately make up part of a usable die.” (*See*, e.g., paragraph 0007 of the current application.) A process aid may be put in a kerf, but a process aid and a kerf are two distinct things. As such, the disclosure of Barrett regarding manipulation of kerf design does not anticipate the claimed invention of, e.g., generating a process aid.

Specifically, for instance, Barrett does not disclose, *inter alia*, “entering a process technology and a process aid type to be built into a program [.]” (Claim 1; similarly claimed in

claims 8 and 15). Barrett uses chip data to generate kerf data/design (*see*, e.g., [0011], [0022], and [0024]), but does not include “entering ... a process aid type to be built into a program[.]” (Claim 1, emphasis added). Please note, a process aid does not ultimately make up part of a usable die. As such, the chip data of Barrett does not include a process type. In view of the foregoing, Barrett does not disclose “entering a process technology and a process aid type to be built into a program [.]”

In addition, Barrett does not disclose, *inter alia*, “reading technology design rules and process aid parameters for the process aid type into the program[.]” (Claim 1; similarly claimed in claims 8 and 15). Contrary to the Office’s assertion, Barrett does not include “process aid parameters.” (*See*, e.g., [0025] and [0026].) Barrett discloses manipulation of the chip design data to include processing assist features for device enhancement, and additional nonfunctional shapes for increased manufacturing line latitude. (*See* [0026].) But these features are not process aids because they make up part of the ultimate die (i.e., device enhancement and additional shape). In addition, Barrett does not include reading process aid parameters. Instead, Barrett only discloses processing parameters.

Moreover, Barrett does not disclose, *inter alia*, “accessing a process aid instruction file to attain instructions for building the process aid[.]” (Claim 1; similarly claimed in claims 8 and 15). Barrett only discloses entering processing parameters, but does not disclose processing aid instruction file. (*See*, e.g., [0027].)

Further, Barrett does not disclose, *inter alia*, “building the process aid in on the wafer using the instructions based on the technology design rules and the process aid parameters.” (Claim 1; similarly claimed in claims 8 and 15). Barrett only discloses manipulating kerf design in the same manner as the chip design manipulation. Barrett does not disclose building a process

aid. As such Barrett does not disclose building the process aid in on the wafer using the instructions based on the technology design rules and the process aid parameters in building a process aid.

In view of the foregoing, Barrett does not anticipate the claimed invention. The dependent claims are believed allowable for the same reasons stated above, as well as for their own additional features.

Applicants respectfully submit that the application is in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that anything further is necessary to place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



Dated: August 30, 2006

---

Michael F. Hoffman  
Reg. No. 40,019

Hoffman, Warnick & D'Alessandro LLC  
75 State Street, 14th Floor  
Albany, New York 12207  
(518) 449-0044  
(518) 449-0047 (fax)